



Wastewater Treatment Facilities Siting Process

***Summary of October 2001 Public Workshops
Woodinville
Edmonds
Bothell***

King County Department of Natural Resources

November 5, 2001



Clean Water – A Sound Investment

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	I
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION	1
PUBLIC WORKSHOP FORMAT	3
SECTION 2: WORKSHOP SUMMARIES.....	4
WOODINVILLE PUBLIC WORKSHOP.....	4
Odor Control.....	5
Cost/Financing.....	5
Conveyance	5
Traffic Congestion.....	5
Siting Process	5
Mitigation	5
Negative Impacts to the Environment and Property Values	6
Jurisdictional Authority	6
Other Sites	6
EDMONDS PUBLIC WORKSHOP	6
Siting Process	7
Odor Control.....	7
Brightwater/ Edmonds Crossing Co-location	7
Environmental Impacts.....	7
Other Land Uses	7
Existing Treatment Plants.....	7
BOTHELL PUBLIC WORKSHOP	8
Other Sites	8
FOLLOW-UP.....	8
APPENDIX A – ADVERTISING IN SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC WORKSHOPS...9	
APPENDIX B – PUBLIC WORKSHOP AGENDA	11

Section 1: Introduction

In November 1999, King County approved its Regional Wastewater Services Plan. One aspect of this plan includes building a new regional wastewater treatment facility somewhere in north King or south Snohomish County by 2010. Policy siting criteria, to evaluate potential sites for the new facility, were developed as a result of input from a variety of sources, including the public. Site screening criteria were adopted by the King County Council in February 2001. These criteria were used to select a set of six candidate sites for further consideration.

The King County Council approved the list of candidate sites and more detailed site selection criteria in May 2001. After this approval the six remaining sites were matched with two conceptual conveyance options (near surface and deep tunnel pipelines) and outfall zone areas. These six “systems” were subjected to further evaluation. As a result of this evaluation, it was determined that four of these met the policy site selection criteria. The King County Executive, in consultation with the Snohomish County Executive, determined that two sites, Edmonds Unocal and Route 9, and their conveyance and outfall options, met both the policy site selection criteria and the broader goals and policies of the region. Edmonds Unocal and Route 9 were thus recommended by the Executive for further consideration. Table 1 provides a description of the six systems that were evaluated and their status as a result of the evaluation.

A series of three public meetings was held to present the evaluation results and to invite the public to comment on these results. In December of 2001, the King County Council will review the Executive’s recommendation, supporting documentation and public comment in order to select final candidate systems for continued evaluation.

This evaluation will include Washington State Environmental Policy Act and National Environmental Policy Act (SEPA/NEPA) environmental review and detailed engineering, geotechnical and cost analysis, as well as continued public involvement.

Public workshops were held at the following locations:

Tuesday, October 9, 2001
Woodinville High School
19819 136th Avenue NE
Woodinville

Wednesday, October 10, 2001
Edmonds-Woodway High School
7600 212th Street
Edmonds

Monday, October 15, 2001
Canyon Park Junior High School
23723 23rd Avenue SE
Bothell

The purpose of the public workshops was to inform citizens of north King and south Snohomish counties about King County's siting process for the new north treatment facilities and to solicit comments from citizens on their issues, concerns and ideas associated with siting a wastewater treatment facility at the proposed locations. This report summarizes the results of the three workshops.

Table 1 – Site Descriptions

Site Name	Location	Current Use	Status
Edmonds Unocal	City of Edmonds, Snohomish County	Unocal operations; inactive tank farm being removed	Met criteria Recommended
Route 9	Unincorporated Snohomish County	Numerous businesses – light industrial	Met criteria Recommended
Point Wells	Unincorporated Snohomish County	Active Chevron Asphalt Plant	Met criteria Not recommended
Gravel Quarry	City of Bothell & Unincorporated Snohomish County	Gravel Quarry and undeveloped land	Met criteria Not recommended
Gun Range	Unincorporated Snohomish County	Kenmore Gun Range	Determined unsuitable
Thrashers Corner	City of Bothell & Unincorporated Snohomish	Low density residential & open space	Determined unsuitable

In order to inform affected and interested citizens about the meeting, King County advertised the public workshops using a variety of methods, including:

- Paid advertisements in a number of area newspapers
- Mass mailings to residents within approximately a half-mile of each candidate site (a total of 27,000 flyers were sent)
- Press releases and public service announcements to area newspapers and radio and television stations
- A media event to announce the proposed final candidate sites.

A complete listing of where and when advertisements were placed is contained in Appendix A of this report.

Public Workshop Format

This section describes the activities that took place at the four workshops. Appendix B contains a copy of the agenda used at the workshops.

The workshops were held from 5:30 to 8:30 p.m. The rooms were set up with a sign-in table and seven information stations, each of which was staffed and stocked with handouts. A separate public comment room provided participants with the opportunity to record their comments in the presence of representatives of the King and Snohomish executives. A court reporter recorded all public comments. The open house and the public comment room were open to the public throughout the entire workshop. Team members staffed each station at the open house. Some stations included a flip chart for public comment. The stations consisted of:

1 – Sign-in table -- participants signed in and received meeting agenda and a comment form. Participants were put on the project's mailing list upon request.

2 – Why we need a third treatment plant/ siting process – identified the work up to the selection of the two proposed final candidate sites. The station also provided information about the RWSP, criteria development and approval, participants in the decision-making process, the siting process and the need for a third plant.

3 – The sites that were not recommended– provided graphics, maps and handouts about Point Wells, the Gravel Quarry, the Gun Range and Thrashers Corner and why they were not recommended for further consideration

4 – Edmonds Unocal – provided graphics, maps and handouts with information about the site and why it was recommended for further consideration. The graphics included a computer-generated conceptual layout for the site.

5 – Route 9 – provided graphics, maps and handouts with information about the site and why it was recommended for further consideration. The graphics included a computer-generated conceptual layout for the site.

6 -- Mitigation – provided graphic descriptions of mitigation opportunities, including examples of mitigation for other facilities in a range of settings.

7 –Conveyance and Outfall – provided graphic and written information about the process for identifying and analyzing conceptual conveyance routes and marine outfall zones.

8 – Odor Control – provided graphic and written information about the latest odor control technologies and how they can be applied to the Brightwater facility.

9 – Next Steps -- provided general information about the overall siting process timeline and a detailed timeline about the next steps in the siting process.

10 – Public table – provided members of the public the opportunity to display information related to their perspectives on the siting process and the sites under consideration.

Section 2: Workshop Summaries

This section of the report summarizes the public comment that was generated at the public workshops for each site under consideration, including written comments, discussions at the open house and formal comments made in the comment room. Comments (received by King County as of October 29, 2001) are incorporated in this report. The original comments, additional comments received after this report's publication and original transcripts from the court reporter are on file with King County Department of Natural Resources Wastewater Treatment Division.

Woodinville Public Workshop

Woodinville High School, October 9, 2001 – 57 participants

Those who participated in the Route 9 workshop had a number of questions and comments about the Brightwater plant. Several of those who attended were enthusiastic about the potential for Brightwater in this location, particularly in light of the opportunity to provide habitat protection to Little Bear Creek and its surrounding environment. Other participants had concerns about the potential odor from the facility, the impacts of the facility on their property values and potential increases in traffic congestion. A summary of comments about other candidate sites is provided at the end of this section. Questions and comments fell under the following major themes:

- Odor Control
- Cost/Financing
- Conveyance
- Traffic Congestion

- Siting Process
- Mitigation
- Negative Impacts to the Environment and Property Values
- Jurisdictional Authority

Odor Control

Some participants at the meeting were particularly concerned about odor control in their neighborhoods. They explained that the Route 9 site sits low and is subject to air inversions. Both odors and moisture (fog) have a tendency to be trapped in the area. They wanted to ensure that King County would install the highest-quality odor control systems in order to prevent offensive odors within their community.

Cost/Financing

Because Route 9 is the most expensive candidate site, there were a number of concerns about the overall cost of the project. Several of those who attended the meeting wanted to know why the most expensive site was still under consideration, given that a number of the other sites had been estimated to be considerably less expensive. Some of those attending, who now have septic tanks, were concerned that they would be forced to hook up to the wastewater system and have to pay new rates to pay for the Brightwater facility. Others simply wanted to know when they could hook up to the system. One individual suggested that all of the homes in the vicinity receive free hook-ups as part of the mitigation package.

Conveyance

There were a number of comments and questions about conveyance pipes and pump stations, especially since the Route 9 site would require substantially more conveyance than the Edmonds Unocal site. Many of those attending the meeting wanted to know what the cost for the conveyance would be, how it would be constructed and how and when residents who live along the conveyance route would be notified. There are a number of concerns related to 228th Avenue, which has experienced major traffic delays and disruption as a result recent construction projects.

Traffic Congestion

The area around the Route 9 site is heavily congested now, and members of the community are worried about potential increases in congestion in the future. They fear the Brightwater facility might contribute substantially to increased traffic.

Siting Process

Several people asked questions and expressed concern about the process that narrowed the six sites to only two sites in light of the fact that four sites met the criteria.

Mitigation

Several of those attending the meeting had specific suggestions for possible mitigation opportunities on the Route 9 site and were enthusiastic about pursuing these opportunities. Suggestions included:

- Enhancements to Little Bear Creek and its surrounding environment
- A “buffer” area to the north of the property
- Bike and walking trails that would connect to larger trails throughout King County
- Trees and other plantings to enhance the green space/screening of the facility
- An educational center related to the environment
- Sportsfields

A few participants commented that the preliminary site plan/layout for Route 9 did not seem to demonstrate the same level of mitigation as the drawing that was developed for the Edmonds Unocal site. Participants clearly expressed opposition to combining Brightwater with a proposed school bus facility.

Negative Impacts to the Environment and Property Values

Although some of those attending the meeting felt that Brightwater could provide mitigation to enhance Little Bear Creek and the surrounding environment, a number of other participants were concerned that the facility would harm the environment, especially the salmon in Little Bear Creek.

A number of those attending the meeting were also concerned about the impact of Brightwater on their property values. Several commented that all their life savings are tied up in their homes, and they did not want to see that value diminish.

Jurisdictional Authority

Several of those attending the meeting were concerned about the fact that King County is siting this facility in Snohomish County. They wanted to know who would be representing them in the process and were concerned about whether their interests would be well-represented.

Other Sites

Several of those commenting believed that the Edmonds Unocal site would be a better option for Brightwater than Route 9.

Edmonds Public Workshop

Edmonds-Woodway High School, October 10, 2001 -- 94 participants

The discussion at the Edmonds workshop produced a number of comments and questions related to the Unocal site. A summary of comments about other candidate sites is provided at the end of this section. Questions and comments fell under the following major themes:

- Siting Process
- Odor control
- Brightwater/ Edmonds Crossing co-location
- Environmental impacts
- Other land uses
- Existing treatment plants

Siting Process

There were a number of comments related to the siting process. Some participants suggested that Point Wells was as suitable or more suitable than Unocal and asked why it was not included as a finalist. Some participants perceived that site selection criteria were added in order to remove specific sites from consideration. A few were concerned that Snohomish County and its cities do not have a formal role in decision-making. There was concern that the high cost of the Route 9 site would preclude it from final selection.

Odor Control

Some participants were concerned about odor impacts on surrounding neighborhoods. Those commenting said that the Edmonds plant smells at times and voiced skepticism regarding King County assertions that a new plant would be able to control odor.

Brightwater/ Edmonds Crossing Co-location

There were a variety of comments about the possibility of co-locating a new wastewater treatment facility and the Edmonds Crossing Project. Some simply thought that the site was too small for both. Others voiced skepticism about the feasibility of carrying out both projects within the identified timeframe. There was also some concern that King County was relying on the Edmonds Crossing Project at a time when there are many unknowns about that project.

Environmental Impacts

There were a number of comments regarding potential environmental impacts at the Unocal Site. People expressed concerns about potential flooding and the potential for landslides. There were comments about the impacts associated with the amount of earthwork that would have to be done in order to build a plant at the site. Some people expressed concern that this earthwork would compact the soils on the site, which would alter the local groundwater system, as well as creeks and wetlands in the area. Others thought that the site's size would not provide adequate buffers. Finally, some noted that the Unocal site does not appear to be well located for water reuse.

Other Land Uses

A number of attendees at the Edmonds meeting were concerned about a wastewater treatment facility at this shoreline view location. They believed that there were better "higher value" uses for the property. For example, a number of people commented that the Unocal site would be better used as a mixed use/residential development.

Existing Treatment Plants

A number of participants discussed the fact that Edmonds already has two treatment plants, one in the downtown area and one serving the Lynnwood area. Some believed that Edmonds already had its "fair share" of wastewater treatment plants, and Edmonds residents should not have to bear the burden of additional treatment facilities in their area. Others suggested that Brightwater should treat the flows from the two existing plants if it is located in Edmonds, and consolidate the Edmonds outfall into the longer and deeper Brightwater outfall.

Bothell Public Workshop

Canyon Park Junior High School, October 15, 2001 – 61 participants

The discussion at the Bothell workshop produced a number of comments and questions related to the Gravel Quarry, Gun Range and Thrashers Corner sites. Most of those attending this workshop were pleased that the Gun Range and Thrashers Corner had been removed from the sites remaining under consideration. They expressed their gratitude to King County for making this decision. Some expressed concern that the Gravel Quarry, which technically met the criteria, could be reconsidered and suggested that additional tests on soil stability would prove that the site is not suitable for a treatment plant.

Other Sites

A number of people attending this meeting commented on the Route 9 and Edmonds sites. They had questions and concerns about: impacts on property values, odor control, negative environmental impacts, the feasibility of partnership opportunities and the possibility for mitigation opportunities.

A representative of the Little Bear Creek Protective Association and the Maltby Neighborhood Association suggested these groups would support Brightwater at the Route 9 location if it was constructed and operated as well as the Vancouver, WA wastewater treatment facility. If it is not built and operated to those standards, he said, then those organizations would strongly oppose Brightwater at the Route 9 site. He also wanted to ensure that environmental enhancements would be a core element of the mitigation program.

Follow-up

All meeting participants who added their name to the mailing list will receive a copy of this report. They will also receive project newsletters and other public notices throughout the process, as well as have the opportunity to participate in future public meetings. For more information about the Brightwater Project, please contact Debra Ross of the King County Wastewater Treatment Division at (206) 684-1344.

Appendix A – Advertising in Support of the Public Workshops

Listed below are the papers in which an advertisement was placed to inform the public about the Public Workshops held on October 9, 10, and 15, 2001.

Newspaper

The Edmonds Paper
The Enterprise Newspapers
Northshore Citizen
Eastside Journal
Seattle Times
Woodinville Weekly
Everett Herald

Dates ads were run

Wed. 10/3
Thurs. 10/4
Thurs. 10/4
Sun. 9/30
Wed. 10/3
Mon. 10/1
Sun. 9/30

Shown below is a copy of the advertisement that was placed in these newspapers:

OUR GROWING REGION NEEDS CLEAN WATER

A new sewage treatment plant called Brightwater is needed to protect public health and the environment in our growing region. For almost 40 years, wastewater from south Snohomish and north King counties has flowed to King County's plants in Seattle and Renton for treatment. The existing plants will reach their capacity in 2010. Brightwater will give us the capacity we need to keep protecting our waterways from pollution. To learn more, check our Website at: <http://dnr.metrokc.gov/wtd/brightwater/>



BRIGHTWATER FINAL CANDIDATE SITES RECOMMENDED

The King and Snohomish County Executives have proposed two final candidate sites for the new plant.

Edmonds Unocal
In Edmonds, surrounded by Pine Street, Edmonds Way, and the marina.

Route 9
Located east of the intersection of 228th St SE and Hwy 9, close to Hwy 522.

Only one site will be selected in 2003 after more detailed analysis. Since the process involves citizens at every step, we need to hear from you before the King County Council confirms the final candidate sites this fall.



KING COUNTY

PLEASE COME TO AN OPEN HOUSE

- Talk directly with Brightwater staff members and get your questions answered.
- Learn more about the proposed final candidate sites, conceptual routes for pipes and outfall to Puget Sound.
- Learn more about how treatment plants are good neighbors -- with community amenities like open space, art and/or sports fields built right in.
- Tell us what you think.

OPEN HOUSE LOCATIONS
Open houses will be held at the following schools from 5:30 -8:30 pm

Tuesday, October 9
Woodinville High School
19819 - 136th Ave NE, Woodinville

Wednesday, October 10
Edmonds - Woodway High
7600 - 212th St SW, Edmonds

Monday, October 15
Canyon Park Jr High
23723 - 23rd Ave SE, Bothell

If you have questions or to request reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities, please call John Phillips at 1-888-707-8571 or (206) 684-6799.

Citizens and King County working for your neighborhood and the environment

Public Service announcements and press releases were also distributed to a number of area newspapers and television and radio stations. These included:

Newspapers

The Seattle Times
The Seattle Post-Intelligencer
South County Journal
Morning News Tribune (Tacoma)
The Weekly
Monroe Monitor
Kirkland Courier
Issaquah Press
The Valley Record
Redmond-Sammamish Valley News
Mercer Island Reporter
West Seattle Herald
Renton Reporter
Kent Reporter
Vashon-Maury Island Beachcomber
Voice of the Valley
Enumclaw Courier-Herald
Daily Journal of Commerce
Puget Sound Business Journal
The Edmonds Paper
The Enterprise Newspapers
The Northshore Citizen
The Eastside Journal
The Woodinville Weekly
The Everett Herald

Television

KOMO-4
KING-5
KIRO-7
KCPQ-13
Northwest Cable News

Radio

KIRO Newsradio 710
KOMO radio
KSER 90.7
KVI
KPLU
KUOW
KCMU
KLSY
KJR
KLSY
KJR
KEZX

Appendix B – Public Workshop Agenda

Brightwater

Public Open House, October 2001

Welcome. Tonight's open house has a flexible agenda to meet your needs.

Learn about the project at these information stations:

- Our region needs Brightwater
- Unocal and Route 9 – the two sites that have been recommended for further consideration
- Pt. Wells and the Gravel Quarry – two sites that also met the criteria, but are not being recommended for further consideration at this time
- Thrashers Corner and the Gun Range - two sites that did not meet the site selection criteria.
- Help us make Brightwater a good neighbor.
- Marine Outfall: studies underway to select the best site for an outfall into Puget Sound.
- Next Steps: how the sites will continue to be evaluated and your opportunities to be involved in the process.

Tell us what you think:

Visit our Comment Room.

Staff from both the King County and Snohomish County executives' offices will be on hand continuously throughout the meeting to listen to your comments. A court reporter will also be recording your comments.

Or put it in writing:

- Fill out a comment form. Leave it tonight; or mail, email, or fax it in at your convenience.
- Write your comments on the large poster boards.

Comments will help shape the Brightwater siting process and will be shared with decision makers including the King and Snohomish County Executives, the King County Council, the Brightwater Siting Advisory Committee and other local elected officials.

Thank you for attending tonight's open house

